

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS

C.A. NO. 04-11807-MLW

AT&T WIRELESS SERVICES OF  
MASSACHUSETTS, INC., d/b/a AT&T  
WIRELESS, and EASTERN TOWERS, LLC,

Plaintiffs

v.

TOWN OF WAYLAND, MASSACHUSETTS,  
BOARD OF APPEALS OF THE TOWN OF  
WAYLAND and JAMES E. GRUMBACH, ERIC B.  
GOLDBERG, STEVEN FUGARAZZO,  
LAWRENCE K. GLICK, SUSAN KOFFMAN,  
SHAUNT SORIAN, ADIA GENNIS, LINDA  
SEGAL, as they are members and alternate members  
of the Board,

Defendants

ADDITIONAL FURTHER MOTION  
TO ENLARGE TIME TO FILE  
RESPONSE TO “PLAINTIFFS’  
MOTION FOR AN ARGUMENT ON  
THE MERITS AND JUDGMENT IN  
THEIR FAVOR ON COUNT II  
(SUBSTANTIAL EVIDENCE)” AND  
“MOTION FOR PRELIMINARY  
INJUNCTION” (ASSENTED TO)

Defendants (collectively, “Town”) hereby move that the time for responding to the Plaintiffs’ “Motion for an Argument on the Merits and Judgment in Their Favor on Count II (Substantial Evidence)” (“Substantial Evidence Motion”) and “Motion for Preliminary Injunction” (collectively, “Plaintiffs’ Motions”) be further enlarged until June 24, 2005.

As grounds for this Motion, the Town relies on the following:

1. This case is an appeal under the Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. §332(c)(7), from the decision by the Board of Appeals to deny zoning permits for a 120-foot-high telecommunications facility at 137 Boston Post Road, Wayland, Massachusetts.
2. The Town filed an assented-to motion that the time for the Town to respond to the Plaintiffs’ Motions would be enlarged until May 27, 2005 and the Court allowed that motion.
3. The Town filed a further assented-to motion agreeing that the time for the Town to respond would be enlarged until June 10, 2005.
4. The Town filed an additional assented-to motion to enlarge time to respond until June 17, 2005.

5. The parties have continued to attempt to mediate the dispute; they met with a mediator on April 26 and May 18, 2005. Since then they are continuing to meet and to discuss settlement among themselves and with the mediator and settlement discussions are progressing.

6. As stated in the prior motions to enlarge time, in order to respond to the Plaintiffs' Motions, the Town will be required to address all of the issues in the litigation, including those which are the subject of expert testimony. The Town's expert will require substantial time to evaluate and respond to the expert allegations in the Plaintiffs' affidavits filed in support of the Motion for Preliminary Injunction.

7. Due to the ongoing settlement efforts, the scope of the Plaintiffs' Motions, and other professional obligations of the Town's counsel, the June 17, 2005 deadline should be further enlarged.

WHEREFORE, the Town requests that the time for it to respond to Plaintiffs' Motions be enlarged to June 24, 2005.

**DEFENDANTS**

By their attorneys,

/s/ Patricia A. Cantor  
 Joel B. Bard (BBO# 029140)  
 Patricia A. Cantor (BBO# 072380)  
 Kopelman and Paige, P.C.  
 31 St. James Avenue  
 Boston, MA 02116  
 (617) 556-0007

ASSENTED-TO  
 PLAINTIFFS  
 By their attorneys,

/s/ Stephen D. Anderson  
 Stephen D. Anderson (BBO#018700)  
 Douglas H. Wilkins (BBO#528000)  
 Anderson & Krieger LLP  
 43 Thorndike Street  
 Cambridge, MA 02141  
 (617) 252-6575